

DOCKETED
NOV - 8 2005

Serial/Patent No.: 09/611,178

Filing/Issue Date: 7/6/00

Applicant: Jack Chang

Title: APPARATUS ON METHOD FOR PBX-INTEGRATED UNIFIED MESSAGING SERVICES ON A SWITCHED BACKBONE

TRP Docket No.: UNI-0001



Atty/Secty Initials: DBR/JPS/blo


Date Mailed: 10/24/05

Docket Due Date: 7/22/05

The following has been received in the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office on the date stamped hereon:

- ☒ Amendment/Response (24 pgs.)
- ☐ Appeal Brief (____ pgs.) (in triplicate)
- ☐ Application - Utility (____ pgs. with cover & abstract)
- ☐ Application - Rule 1.53(b) Continuation (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Application - Rule 1.53(b) Division (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Application - Rule 1.53(b) CIP (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Application - Rule 1.53(d) CPA (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Application - PCT (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Application - Provisional (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Assignment and Cover Sheet
- ☐ Certificate of Correction
- ☒ Certificate of Mailing
- ☐ Declaration & POA (____ pgs.)
- ☒ Fee Transmittal
- ☐ Drawings (informal):
____ # of sheets includes ____ figures
- ☒ Other:
Declaration of Jack H. Chang Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.31;
Exhibits A-I.
- ☐ IDS & PTO 1449 (____ pgs.)
- ☐ ____ Pieces of Prior Art Enclosed
- ☐ Issue Fee Transmittal
- ☐ Submission of Formal Drawings
____ # of sheets includes ____ figures
- ☐ Notice of Appeal
- ☒ Postcard
- ☐ Preliminary Amendment (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Reply Brief (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Req and Cert. Not to Publish - Rule 1.213
- ☐ Request for Continued Examination (RCE) (____ pgs.)
- ☐ Request for Extension of Time ____ Month(s)
- ☐ Response to Notice to File Missing Parts
- ☐ Copy of PTO Notice to File Missing Parts
- ☒ Transmittal Letter (original)
- ☐ Express Mail No.: ____
- ☒ Check(s) \$510.00
- ☐ Deposit Acct. No. 50-1698 \$____
- Patent Code: 2253
- Client/Matter # 32771-2





Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary

Application No.: 09/611,178 First Named Applicant Jack Chang

Examiner: Lisa Hashem Art Unit: 2645 Status of Application: Pending

Participants: (1) Examiner Lisa Hashem

(2) John Schaub

(3) _____ (4) _____

Date of Interview: March 23, 2006 Time: 2:30 PM (EST)

Type of Interview:

(a) ☒ Telephonic

(b) ☐ Personal

(c) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rejection</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Skladman, Rigaldies</u>	X		X
(2) <u>37 CFR 1.131</u>	<u>Affidavit filed October 24, 2005</u>	<u>Exh. G and I</u>	X		X

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

☐ Copy of Draft Amendment (attached)

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The 35 USC 103 Rejection of claim 1 over Skladman in view of Rigaldies was discussed. Exhibits G and I to the 37 CFR 1.131 Affidavit filed October 24, 2005 were also discussed. No agreement was reached.


Note: The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the Examiner was reached at the interview.

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

John P. Schaub, Reg. No. 42,125

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Printed Name)



(Applicant/Applicant's Authorized signature)